



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,302	09/11/2003	Nobumasa Suzuki	P24196	3567

7055 7590 12/22/2010  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE  
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER
----------

BARRETT, THOMAS C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3775

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

12/22/2010

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com  
pto@gbpatent.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

*Ex parte* NOBUMASA SUZUKI, YUTAKA NOHARA, SHINNOSUKE  
NAKAHARA, SHIGENOBU SATO, KAZUMASA UEYAMA,  
KAZUHIRO HASEGAWA, KAZUYA ORIBE and  
HIROSHI TAKAMIDO

---

Appeal 2009-011661  
Application 10/659,302  
Technology Center 3700

---

Before LINDA E. HORNER, STEVEN D.A. McCARTHY and  
KEN B. BARRETT, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

McCARTHY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The two-month time period for filing an appeal or commencing a civil action, as recited in 37 C.F.R. § 1.304, or for filing a request for rehearing, as recited in 37 C.F.R. § 41.52, begins to run from the “MAIL DATE” (paper delivery mode) or the “NOTIFICATION DATE” (electronic delivery mode) shown on the PTOL-90A cover letter attached to this decision.

The Appellants appeal the Examiner's final decision rejecting claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 134. More specifically, the Examiner rejects claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jackson (US 6,110,172, issued Aug. 29, 2000). We have jurisdiction over the appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We REVERSE.

Claims 1 and 3 are independent claims. Claim 1 recites:

1. A rod fixing apparatus for a vertebra connecting member connecting separated vertebrae, the rod fixing apparatus comprising:

a pressure fixing device configured to pressure fix a rod portion to a circular arc rod engagement portion engaging the rod portion; and

protruding portions configured to engage into the rod portion in both end sides of the circular arc rod engagement portion outside the pressure fixing device, the protruding portions extending in a direction substantially perpendicular to a longitudinal direction of the vertebra connecting member.

Claim 3 recites a rod fixing apparatus including "small projections extending in a direction substantially perpendicular to a longitudinal direction of the rod."

Jackson describes a bone screw assembly 1. The bone screw assembly 1 includes a bone screw 2, a cap 3 and a set screw 4. (Jackson, col. 4, ll. 8-9.) The bone screw 2 includes a head 7. The head 7 has a plurality of ridges 17 formed in a U-shaped channel 10. The ridges 17 extend from a first face 18 of the head 7 to a second face 19. The ridges 17 are adapted to engage an outer surface of a spinal rod 15 to secure the spinal rod 15 in the U-shaped channel 10. (Jackson, col. 4, ll. 10-11 and 21-26.)

1           The Examiner finds that ridges 17 “individually have a width that  
2 extends[,]” or the ridges 17 “as a group extend[,]” perpendicular to the  
3 longitudinal axis. (Ans. 5.) In other words, each ridge has a width along a  
4 direction substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal direction of the  
5 vertebra connecting member. Although each ridge 17 also has a length  
6 which is greater than the ridge’s width, the ridge in a sense extends some  
7 finite distance along its width. Furthermore, the ridges 17 are arrayed next  
8 to one another along the width direction. In this sense, the combination of  
9 the widths of the group of ridges 17 extends in a direction substantially  
10 perpendicular to the longitudinal direction of the vertebra connecting  
11 member.

12           The Appellants correctly contend that both rationales depend on  
13 unreasonably broad claim interpretations. (Reply Br. 3.) The Specification  
14 does not disclose any example in which the width of an elongated projecting  
15 portion extends substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of a  
16 vertebra connecting member. Instead, substantially all of the examples  
17 showing elongated projecting portions appear to show the lengths of the  
18 projecting portions extending substantially perpendicularly to the  
19 longitudinal axis. (See, e.g., Spec., figs. 2A (ref. num. 15), 2B (*simile*), 4A  
20 (ref. num. 29), 4B (*simile*) and 5 (ref. num. 37)). In order for claim 1 to  
21 encompass at least one embodiment disclosed in the Specification, one of  
22 ordinary skill in the art must understand the term “protruding portions  
23 extending in a direction substantially perpendicular to a longitudinal  
24 direction” to mean that each protruding portion has a length extending  
25 substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal axis. Nothing in the claim  
26 language or the Specification implies that one of ordinary skill in the art

1 would have reason to understand the term to also mean the opposite, namely,  
2 that each protruding portion has a width extending perpendicular to the  
3 longitudinal axis.

4 The Appellants point out that Jackson specifically discloses “the  
5 ridges 17 ‘*extend* from a first or front face 18 to a second or rear face 19’.”  
6 (Reply Br. 4) (italics in original.) As such “each ridge 17 extends in a  
7 direction *parallel* to the longitudinal direction of the spinal rod 15” (Reply  
8 Br. 3) (italics in original.)

9 We do not sustain the rejections of claims 1 and 3 under § 102(b) as  
10 being anticipated by Jackson. Consequently, we also do not sustain the  
11 rejection of dependent claim 2 under § 102(b) as being anticipated by  
12 Jackson.

13  
14 DECISION

15 We REVERSE the Examiner’s decision rejecting claims 1-3.

16  
17 REVERSED

18  
19  
20  
21 Klh

22  
23 GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
24 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE  
25 RESTON, VA 20191